FELLOWSHIP

March 1943 Vol. IX—No. 3

LIBRARY
ANDOVER NEWTON
THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

"Our weapon is the smallest possible — nobody can find it. Even with all their brainpower and ingenuity the task would be impossible. The effect of the weapon is visible and traceable, but the weapon itself is never found. In an age of swords its effect is peace, joy and frankness, and faithfulness to what is holy. No other weapon can compare with it. It melts ice, spreads light, brings warmth. It creates and alters, drives out doubt and despondency and stands guard. It marches victoriously through locked gates, so that he who sits in prison finds consolation, and is enabled to live through the word of his people and the God they worship."

— Danish Folk School Periodical quoted by Worldover Press

The Shape of the Future

by

VERA BRITTAIN

•

The Why and How of Meditation by Allan Hunter

Sowing the Dragon's Teeth by A. J. Muste

Community Economic Planning by Arthur E. Morgan

In Defense of C.P.S. by Three Campers

•

The Chaplain and the Church

by

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE

15 cents a copy $1.50 a Year

John Haynes Holmes

I

IS there a difference between war and savagery? In essence, No! War began as a phase of savagery, and continues as such to this day. Yet there is a distinction between war as fought by conscientious and honorable men, and what we may call "sheer savagery." The Hague Conferences tried hard to find this distinction and define it, with ill success. Now the Nazis are unconsciously taking up the task, and showing us how war, terrible as it is in itself, may become something yet far worse.

Thus, is it not something worse than war, i.e., sheer savagery, when the Nazis make their so-called *Baedecker* raids on England? The bombing of any center of civilian population is abominable. The Hague Conferences attempted to outlaw this enormity by establishing a distinction between fortified and unfortified cities. But an industrial age, wherein the war front is quite as much in the factory as on the battlefield, has wiped out such distinction. England at least has the credit to date of loosing her bombers only on ports, shipyards, railroads, manufacturing areas, and munition plants. Even this has involved such massacre of civilians as to shock any but the most brutal consciousness. There are alarming signs that the British High Command is becoming as indifferent to civilian casualties as the Nazis—an infallible sign of the degenerative influences of war! But I have as yet seen no record of the British deliberately bombing civilian areas for their own sake, as the Nazis deliberately bombed Canterbury, Exeter, and Bath. Such attacks from the air are sheer savagery, and are indefensible, by whomsoever perpetrated, in any code of conflict. To Britain's charge there stands rather the cold horror of a sea blockade which dooms millions of innocent Europeans to slow starvation.

Again, it is not war, but sheer savagery, to arrest and kill hostages. This matter of hostages carries us back into the darkest periods of barbarism, when skin-clad men, under the leadership of fierce chieftains, made war on one another. It survived into Roman days, when commanders and kings exchanged hostages in pledge of faith. Now the Nazis are seizing hostages by the hundreds, and using them as means to subdue the conquered and oppressed populations of Occupied Europe. The verified reports, many of them direct from the Nazi authorities themselves, some of them from escaped victims (see the August, 1942, *Readers' Digest*), chill the blood and paralyze the nerves. It is perhaps only natural that it should be proposed to use German prisoners as hostages, to be slain after the example of the Nazis. But this would be not a correction nor even a prevention, but rather only an extension, of this essential savagery.

Retaliation is another instance of sheer savagery as distinct from war. The killing of hostages is of course a form of retaliation. But the Nazis have given this principle a very special and hideous aspect, which sets it quite apart by itself. Lidice, the little Czechoslovakian town, wiped out in revenge for the assassination of a brutal Gestapo agent, is the perfect example of what I mean. One has to go far back in history to find anything to match this horror. Yet there are those who would match it today by destroying one innocent German village for every such village destroyed by the enemy. But God forbid that such savagery as this should be added to our war!

It is to be noted that these dreadful deeds are not the atrocity tales with which we became so familiar in the last war. There are atrocity tales in this war that are easily identified as war propaganda. But in this war, as not in the last war, we have horrors that are the boast of those who perpetrate them. Here the Japanese are guilty with the Germans, as witness the rape of Nanking and the cruelties at Hong Kong. These things are savagery, naked and unashamed.

It stands to the glory of human nature that war has at times been raised to a plane of honor, as in the Age of Chivalry. But war remains what it is, and therefore tends always to revert to type, as today when it has plunged into the pit of barbarism. Nothing short of ending war will solve the problem. Either get rid of war, or return to the Dark Ages.

II

That right-minded men now recognize that war and civilization can no longer exist together, but that the former is bound to drag down the latter into savagery, is one of the genuinely hopeful signs of the times. The trouble is that men do not see what is involved in this business of ending war. Thus, there are those who believe that war itself can be used to accomplish its own end, and therewith establish peace. This is the madness of Hitler who deliberately uses war as the means of subduing the world in the interest of his New Order, which he expects to endure for a thousand years. We ourselves share in this madness when we talk about a "war to end war." War can no more end war than Satan can cast out Satan.

There are others who believe that peace can still be wrought out of war, in spite of every influence against it, by the sheer creative resolve of men to have it so. These would not enter or wage a war for the sake of ending war. They realize that, if peace were to come after a war, it would be in spite and not because of the fighting. But they refuse to believe that man can be defeated even by war, and cling therefore to the hope that, even in "the breaking of nations," there may still be found the way to "create great peace."

The pacifists, I suppose, all join in this desperate hope. At any rate they likewise refuse to give up the fight for peace even while war is raging all about them. But they understand, as others do not, that war in its very nature is the enemy of peace; and that only a complete renunciation of war at all times and under all conditions can ever bring us to our goal. It is the insistence of the pacifist, in other words, that war will not be banished from society until it is banished from the heart. Hence his uncompromising stand against it *now!*

FELLOWSHIP
Published by the
FELLOWSHIP OF
RECONCILIATION
2929 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, A. J. MUSTE } *Editors*
R. ALFRED HASSLER
Managing Editor
EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS
Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Dorothy Detzer
Eugene Exman
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Helene Hale
John Haynes Holmes
Amos B. Hulen
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Willis J. King
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Elmore M. McKee
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Donovan E. Smucker
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman
FELLOWSHIP is published monthly. Reentered as second class matter February 15, 1941, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.
15 Cents a Copy $1.50 a Year

FELLOWSHIP

THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

March 1943 **Vol. IX—No. 3**

Behind the holocaust of total war there is building up "the shape of the future." What will it be like? Here England's famous pacifist writer pictures it in the second of the "After the Armistice" series —

The Shape of the Future*

By VERA BRITTAIN

TODAY, wherever we go, we hear speculations concerning the future. In a favorite book of my youth, *The Story of an African Farm,* Oliver Schreiner, describing the death of her heroine, wrote: "There is a veil of terrible mist over the face of the Hereafter." The mist which obscures the period immediately before us here and now is hardly less impenetrable. Even the present is dark and confused. The past alone remains clear to those who can interpret it. Does it tell us anything about this age of chaos in which we are living? Can it give us even a pointer toward the shape of the future?

The nationalism of Britain and other European countries began about the time of the Renaissance. We live today in a revolutionary epoch because we are reaching the end of that age of the nation-state, and have not yet evolved the political and economic structure which is to replace it. After the last war—which was really the first stage of this one—an attempt to create it was made in the Covenant of the League of Nations. That experiment failed because the moral standards of European statesmen were not equal to the machinery at their disposal. The bold, imaginative generosity which England was given so clear an opportunity to exercise required a new type of courage and wisdom which our rulers did not possess.

Nor were they capable of the narrow but effective variety of courage which enabled us to build and hold our Empire despite the vices native to imperialism. Their policy was one of weak provocation, which worked neither for war nor for peace. They kept the vices but let the courage go. The birth pangs of the new era, which might have been less painful, have therefore taken the acute form of the present war. This is nothing less than a struggle between the liberal democratic ideals of the French Revolution (which Britain, incidentally, opposed), and the counterrevolution symbolized by Hitler and the Nazis.

This counterrevolution, being reactionary, uses reactionary weapons: the weapons of war and tyranny. It cannot be permanently conquered by its own weapons, for, believing in them, it will always handle them better than those who take to them reluctantly. The democracies should never have attempted to oppose it by copying its methods. The only effective way of fighting it is by mental and spiritual weapons, opposing it from without, acting as a leaven that undermines it from within. The real match for Hitler today is Gandhi. Gandhi's methods, being also revolutionary but not reactionary, would finally defeat aggression, however, temporarily apparent the victory of militarism might be. But our governmental clique has neither the courage nor the imagination to let him apply them even in his own country, whose liberation from imperialism has become the acid test of British intentions in this war.

If you want to find an age of history comparable to our own for disturbance and disaster, turn back to the fall of the Roman Empire. When the Goths sacked Rome in A.D. 410, the men of those days believed that the light of civilization had been extinguished. Their mood must have been similar to that of Sir Edward Grey, who, too prophetically, saw the lamps going out all over Europe in August, 1914. But it was just at the time of Rome's eclipse that Saint Augustine began to set down his vision of a City of God which would outlast all earthly empires.

Augustine could not know that the fall of Rome would be followed by an age of barbarism; and that in its turn by an age of feudalism, and feudalism by an epoch of industrialism, of which the breakdown would lead to the modern totalitarian state. But he could, and did, achieve two things. He could analyze the causes of the downfall of Rome; and he could describe and assess those eternal values upon which life would build itself anew when the cataclysm was past.

We can follow his example today by asking ourselves

*From *Humiliation with Honor,* published this month by the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

three questions, and trying to answer them. *First,* what were the deep underlying causes of the two World Wars, as distinct from those more immediate causes which historians call "occasions"? *Second,* how can we rediscover the abiding values in the midst of catastrophe? *Third,* how far can we begin, however humbly, to order our lives by these values in such a fashion that, whatever may be the shape of the future, we can influence it for the better and thus help to divert the course of history into new channels? To be sure of the things that matter, to distinguish between the temporal and the eternal—that is the first of all duties for peacemakers today.

The major causes of this war show how the history of modern Germany has tended to put her most aggressive minorities into power. Let us summarize them.

First, chronologically, came the break-up of the unity of Christendom by the Reformation, which set out to remedy the shortcomings of the medieval Church, but in the process created a number of state churches that substituted the religion of nationalism for the religion of Christ. This development was itself a part of the second underlying cause—the rise of the nation-states whose leaders, in their different fashions, preached and practiced the doctrine of "Reason of State." According to this theory, the collective state possessed a godhead of its own and became a law unto itself. Hence the political world has been rent by mutually incompatible conceptions of national sovereignty, and the economic world by a chaotic scramble to control the earth's resources.

Some Came Late

Second, the earliest nations to be united as states developed an urge for empire-building after the voyages of the Great Discoverers had revealed the existence of rich new territories ripe for exploitation, but Germany and Italy came late into the race because of their delayed unification. Like Japan, they found themselves "Have Not" Powers, which could increase their territories and markets only by means of aggressive military programs. These programs have not unnaturally been carried out by buccaneers and paranoiacs who climbed to leadership by taking advantage of their maladjusted communities. Unlike the smaller and less amibitious countries, these so-called "Great Powers" added to their economic needs a biological impulse, arising from the pressure of national populations which desired to expand within the confines of their own "state," or, like Japan, to find space and economic opportunity inside some other country with a higher standard of living.

At the beginning of this war, Britain and France between them owned more than sixteen million square miles of the earth's surface, excluding the mandated territories lost by Germany after the Treaty of Versailles. In April, 1940, two months before the fall of France, I found myself in Paris on my way home, via Lisbon, from the United States. Everywhere I saw, on the walls of offices, shops, and railway stations, large maps of the world in which French and British territories were colored red. Beneath these maps ran the caption: "We shall win because we are the strongest." From American Friends who left France more recently, I have learned that the remnants of the maps can still be distinguished beneath Nazi notices on the walls of Paris—a forlorn commentary on the fact that great possessions are not a source of security, but of the envy, hatred, and fear which lead nations into war.

The third cause of the two World Wars has been the failure of the capitalistic system to give security and a decent life to the common citizen. Its emphasis was placed upon private profit-making; the few pursued material gain at the expense of the many, until the state itself was called upon to support the vested interests of the profiteers. This trend has been exaggerated by the technological processes of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, with their consequence in mass unemployment and their destruction of human personality by mechanization. It was large-scale unemployment, you may remember, which Hitler was elected to remedy. He accomplished this first by eliminating from the labor market certain classes, such as Jews, women, and Social Democrats; and secondly by building a great military machine. War always offers the easiest apparent solution for unemployment. Actually, it is only a ruinous postponement, which sacrifices great wealth and vast populations to the wheels of Juggernaut.

This machine, with the terrible capacity for devastation which human inventiveness has given it, brings us to the fourth of our basic causes of war. The swift impetus of modern scientific development might have been used to free the lives of all men from want, loneliness, and insecurity. Instead, it has outpaced their moral ability to control its direction, which is now almost entirely destructive. The desire for power is today strangely allied with a universal impulse toward death. Deep in human nature there seems to lie a perversity which is wholly evil, since it is contrary both to man's material interest and his finer aspirations. It was as though Lucifer, when he fell from heaven, found the means to insinuate a drop of poison into each of the human souls that God has made throughout His ages of Creation. Man's real war is not against his fellow man, but against that drop of poison in himself. One purpose of the new era struggling so frantically into life must be to find and isolate this elusive poison, as a germ has to be isolated before the disease which it causes can be cured.

To divert the course of history would mean a reversal of the four major trends which, for all their potentiality for good, have brought such evil results. The restoration of religious unity through the revitalization of the Christian churches; the substitution of an international authority for national sovereignty and competitive imperialism; the change from capitalism to socialism, already visible in the war-time transformation of industry from private ownership to state control; the development of man's moral nature above the level of his scientific inventiveness: these must be the long-range objectives of any society which hopes for permanence. Chronologically, the last should come first, lest the human race destroy itself before it can turn its attention to the other three.

Christianity vs. Nationalism

The history of the past four centuries, sharply mirrored in the story of the last twenty years, has proved that the practice of Christianity and the preservation of nationalism are incompatible. One or the other must go. The protection of national cultures has great value, but to preserve the temporal power of the nation-state is fatal to any Kingdom which is not of this world. Those who be-

lieve the dominant state to be more important than a Christian society should put all their energies into defending it; but others who accept the validity of the Gospel cannot defend the state when to maintain it means the sacrifice of the faith by which they live. For them this war is the inevitable Nemesis which has followed the errors made by allied statesmen after the last. If these errors had not produced their Day of Judgment, the working of a moral law in history would be less clearly demonstrated and Christian promises less abundantly fulfilled. Never has it seemed so incontestable that different results can be obtained only by a full acceptance of Christ's teaching and a sincere attempt to build the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. The sacrifices of power and prestige which that Kingdom demands must be faced and fulfilled before the race of men can count on survival.

> "It is as natural" (writes a New Zealand clergyman) "for the world to be at war today as it is for typhoid germs to breed in open drains and for frogs to breed in stagnant pools. . . . It is the chastisement of men upon men for the flagrant disregard and criminal distortion of Divine Truth."[1]

Yet the same men can construct, if they desire, a new international organization in which the worst evils of the state will disappear; they can control those vested interests which take so much more out of society than they ever put into it; they can initiate an age of science in which the chief object of study and experiment will no longer be military destruction, but the vast unexplored continent of the human mind where the roots of war lie. These voyages of psychological discovery will perhaps be part of a new education, directed toward producing a finer type of being both physically and morally. The problem is one of creating a spiritual authority strong enough to discipline mental capacity, which has outrun the power of the soul.

At present these high achievements are objectives only. There will be no historical vacuum in which their pursuit can take place unimpeded by the contrary pressure of circumstances. Even their preparation cannot begin without some attempt to visualize alternative situations and the type of action which these will compel. The character of the future, and the work of those who endeavor to foresee it, must be determined by one of three possible outcomes of the war: an Allied defeat, an Allied victory, or a negotiated peace following a stalemate or a revival of sanity.

You probably have observed that the larger our catastrophies, the louder become the prophecies of "ultimate victory." As an English humorist remarked, "The worse the news is, the more we talk about what we are going to do with Germany after the war." Far more reassuring than this universal variant on whistling to keep up our courage are some facts which recently appeared in *Fellowship*[2] in "You Cannot Kill the Spirit," by Leonard S. Kenworthy, who directed the Quaker Center in Berlin from June, 1940 to June, 1941. Mr. Kenworthy described the persistence of religion in Germany despite the Nazis, and attaches especial importance to the small groups all over the country who come together for spiritual fellowship. He wrote:

> "They are not political, they are religious cells. In many respects they resemble the small communities of first-century Christians. They read and pray together. They discuss their personal problems with each other. They are extremely important to the future of Christianity in Central Europe."

Here is a prescription for the revival of religion more reliable than our long-pursued but elusive victory. It offers us a tolerable way of life even if we never catch up with the political and military triumph of which our leaders still feel so certain. In Germany itself the Nazis have been unable to destroy the spirit. The present methods of the German Christians might well be our only defense against the dread future suggested by Mr. Churchill in a speech made on November 11, 1938: "I have always said that, if Great Britain were defeated in war, I hoped we should find a Hitler to lead us back to our rightful position among nations."

The Problems of Victory

Dark as such a prospect appears, many responsible leaders of opinion are coming to realize that "ultimate victory" may present us with problems at least as appalling. One of the best recent summaries of its probable consequences was contributed by the Bishop of Chichester to the *Christian News-Letter*. Describing a recent visit to Sweden, the Bishop remarks how "strangely isolated" England now is from most European countries. Newly enlightened with regard to Europe from the angle of the peoples concerned, the Bishop inquires what will happen in the political vacuum created by the downfall of Hitlerism:

> "When the crash comes—*What next?* . . . Even before food can be distributed, order is indispensable. With the collapse of the Nazi regime there is the immediate danger of civil war all over Germany, in which the two million men and women from the Occupied Countries now doing forced labor as slaves may have something to say. . . . Once the news reaches Norway, Holland, Belgium, Moravia, Yugoslavia, that Hitler and all his men have fallen — *What then?* Just because the provocations have been so great we have to beware of a different kind of bloodshed on a terrible scale. . . . The whole situation is big with peril."

In the light of the possibility here suggested that "the last state of Europe may be worse than the first," what rational person can regard "victory" as something to be cheerfully acclaimed and pictured in glowing colors, however long its achievement may take? Modern civilization, with its large populations which have to be fed and its crowded industrial cities where epidemics spread like forest fires, cannot afford universal war. The cost in human suffering is too great, the breakdown of the machinery of living too complete. Until the present conflict ends, our work for the diversion of history into new channels can be no more than a preliminary looking forward, an uncertain preparation.

Hence the most practical move we can make is to press for the ending of the war by an armistice, a prolonged conference, and a negotiated peace. "There is no way of ending sin except persuading sinners to leave it off," writes Walter Walsh in *Jesus; War or Peace?* There is no way of ending war except by urging those who are fighting to give it up, and try a better method of settling their dispute. Even a pause might recall how little connection exists between its long-ago "occasions," and those fundamental causes which war always aggravates and can never remove.

[1] The Rev. C. W. Chandler, in the *Auckland Star*, January 31, 1942.
[2] June, 1942.

Meanwhile, we have to confront and try to reduce our own share of responsibility for humanity's failure. What really underlies the sorry story of four centuries, the deeper causes of revolutionary war traced from the Reformation to the present day? Is not the same tale of greed, ambition, fear, and vindictiveness to be found in our own lives and our relations with our neighbors? The acquisitiveness exposed by rationing, the widespread hoarding of scarce commodities, the envy of a neighbor's house, the secret joy in an acquaintance's downfall: are they not evidence of the same self-interest which when enlarged becomes capitalism, imperialism, and competitive nationalism? We shall make the shape of the future no better than the ugly shape of the past unless we learn to give more than lip service to the Christian virtues which most of us extol. The failure has not lain in the political machinery at the disposal of the age, but in those who misused or ignored it. "We needs must love the highest when we see it," wrote Tennyson; yet man, offered the highest, has deliberately permitted his lower nature to occupy the driver's seat.

But not always. Most of our everyday social rules are based upon the abundantly justified assumption of decency, kindness, and common sense in the mass of human beings. The daily newspapers are filled with evidence that man's instinct is to save life, not to destroy it. For example, the *Daily Herald* for August 24, 1942 contained a striking description, by Hannan Swaffer, of the rescue of a child evacuee who had fallen down a mountain crevice in land that was in danger of subsidence, after seventeen men and boys had struggled unceasingly to reach her for fifteen hours. Our traffic laws rest on the supposition that travelers will respect one another's safety, and refrain from running somebody down the moment that they take to the road. Our postal system is founded on the well-established belief that the great majority of mankind can be trusted with other people's possessions. When ordinary men and women from different nations get together for some international purpose, they do not instinctively dislike one another. They begin to hate only when war-making politicians inflame their emotions with propaganda, and their rulers, corrupted by power, urge them to deeds of violence. Search through the private correspondence of friends, or the small items on the inner pages of obscure magazines, and even now you will discover numerous examples of kindness on the battlefield, in prison, in hospital, or internment camp. The best hope for the future lies in the thousand similar instances of human cooperation that we shall find when the warring governments lift the veil of silence through which only stories of cruelty and hatred are permitted to emerge.

Some day peace will return, and with it, perhaps, a measure of sanity. Man, though foolish, lethargic, and corruptible, has nevertheless an undying capacity for spiritual resurrection; his impulse toward death is balanced by an indestructible principle of life. In that hour of awakening, men and women will examine, realistically and with horror, the consequences of this madness of destruction which their leaders began and which they accepted; and will turn, as they turned once before, to the few who kept their heads and provided a nucleus of reason in a world of confusion.

When the pacifist minority is no longer penalized by the wielders of power, it may well be asked to consider how the common peoples of Britain and Germany, purged by suffering, may find a way of life together, freed from the menace of their privileged classes to their mutual interests. Perhaps we shall help our ex-enemies to acknowledge their acquiescence in evil by admitting our own; for we have also a confession to make. We too have propounded, in our colonial territories and above all in India, an intolerable theory of racial superiority; and if we did not seek to "dominate the world," it was because, in markets and on trade routes, we were supreme already. We, the British people, consented to the dividing of Europe in our own interests, instead of uniting it for humanity's welfare. We allowed our leaders to scheme for power, instead of creating an international society based on confidence and friendship. For our own lack of vision, the common peoples of the world have paid. Perhaps the weary days spent in food queues and the sleepless nights passed in shelters will acquire a retrospective value from the mutual sympathy felt by the men and women of many nations who have endured both; and, understanding that our fears, our hopes, and our affections are the same, we shall turn to one another for much-needed cooperation in rebuilding the beauty which has been destroyed.

That work of reconstruction will demand every gift which can be contributed to the common weal by all the races of men: the black, the brown, the yellow, the white, "whose prayers go up to one God under different names." Let us therefore seek to end the unnecessary handicaps which have hitherto prevented the full realization of such gifts: the race and class prejudice that sets artificial barriers to the progress of millions; the frustration of women's abilities by tradition and self-interest; the tyranny which age still exercises over youth. The mobilization of all the capacity available on earth will not be too great for the restoration of order to the chaos which this conflict will leave behind it, nor for the solution of the human problems upon which the shape of the future depends.

Forthcoming Articles in the Series —

AFTER THE ARMISTICE

will be written by these outstanding men:

Tracy Strong
General Secretary of the World Committee, Y.M.C.A.

Scott Nearing
Sociologist and Economist, Lecturer at the Rand School of Social Sciences

Ferner Nuhn
Author of "The Wind Blew from the East"

William B. Hesseltine
Professor of History University of Wisconsin

Walter G. Muelder
Professor of Christian Ethics, University of Southern California

Howard Thurman
Dean of the Chapel, Howard University

Does the Church compromise her witness by the military chaplaincy? The Co-Secretary of the FOR gives his view on this timely question in —

The Chaplain and the Church

By JOHN NEVIN SAYRE

I

LAST December the Federal Council of Churches, meeting in biennial session, summoned the churches of the nation to go all out in providing chaplains for the present war. The Council after urging "churches to make such adjustments in their work as are necessary to release an adequate number of ministers for service in the chaplaincy" went so far as to say, *"We regard this service as the greatest spiritual and evangelistic opportunity among American young men today."*

Certainly the army, the navy, and the government ought to be fully satisfied with this unqualified call to provide pastors for the fighting forces. It represents a complete victory for the army view in the Federal Council of Churches' attitude toward the chaplaincy, a victory won some years ago when a committee appointed by the Council turned down the overtures of several large denominations, and a National Conference on the Churches and World Peace, that requested the Council to divorce the chaplaincy from military authority. The International Convention of the Disciples, in 1936, in calling for withdrawal of its representatives from the Federal Council's Chaplaincy Commission, said: "We request the Federal Council to sever its official connection with the war system by dissolving its Chaplaincy Commission and . . . to provide a non-military ministry of religion to men in the armed services at the churches' own expense and under their own authority without involving the Church of Christ in any alliance whatsoever with the state or military system."

In England, Dr. F. W. Norwood had stirred sharp debate in the Congregational Union by introducing a resolution to refrain from nominating chaplains to the armed forces "unless upon an entirely voluntary basis subject only to the discipline of the Church." On the continent the *Ministers' International Peace Union,* with affiliated societies in Holland, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, had made "urgent appeal to the Christian churches to consider it their duty . . . to declare the office of commissioned military chaplain inconsistent with the Gospel."

This issue came especially to the fore as shame overtook the churches for presenting arms in the war just past and when it looked, for a moment, as if secular governments might actually be ahead of the Church in making war an outlaw institution through the Kellogg Pact. Disciples, Methodists, Baptists, and others passed resolutions against the military chaplaincy and compulsory drill in church schools and public schools. The *Christian Century* ran articles and editorials urging the churches to excommunicate war and reconstruct the chaplaincy on a non-military independent basis. Kirby Page's *Church and War Questionnaire* circulated to 20,870 American ministers revealed that 8,534 could conscientiously serve as chaplains on active duty in war time, but that 8,014 could *not,* and that 3,779 were undecided.

The movement to separate the Church from the war system was making such headway that the *Army and Navy Register* of June 30, 1936 singled out the Methodists for especial attack, and declared: "We propose that the war and navy departments terminate under proper procedure the commissions of all Methodist chaplains in regular land or naval forces who uphold 'the peace pact of Methodists.' We propose that the war and navy departments terminate, for the convenience of the government, all reserve commissions held by Methodist clergymen and laymen."

Well, the *Army and Navy Register* need not have worried. The pendulum has swung back their way. Nevertheless the issue is not settled. The objections raised against the military chaplaincy are sure to recur. They will haunt the post-war peace and unless the churches watch their step far more carefully than they appear to be doing, their influence in that day over the minds of men is going to be seriously affected.

I would not have anyone suppose that I am unsympathetic to the needs of conscript soldiers, many of them mere boys, for a ministry of religion in this time of terrible ordeal. Nor do I fail to appreciate the unselfishness, sincerity, and often heroism, of many individual chaplains. I have dear friends among them. There were chaplains in the last war like Studdert Kennedy, Charles Raven, and others less well known, whom God undoubtedly used to his honor and glory. I believe it will be so again. Yet there were a number of men for whom the chaplaincy was spiritual shipwreck. And I cannot escape the feeling that for most, the situation is like that of being marched into an unsuspected trap. The requirements of the chaplaincy run counter to the Christian witness at a number of its most vital points. This conflict is usually obscured at the beginning of a war when drums roll out across the land and summon the Church to fall into line with the nation's marching soldiers.

II

The military chaplaincy introduces a fatal division into the witness and life of the ecumenical Church. The chaplain in uniform, an officer of army or navy in the pay of a national government and subject to orders from a military commander, owes allegiance to two authorities which cannot escape collision. The chaplain has vowed allegiance to Christ and Caesar—two masters each of whom asks for total loyalty, especially in a war situation. No one would claim that Christ and the army's Commander-in-

Chief are the same. But then the chaplain must reconcile, if he can, service to differently-minded masters.

In a penetrating essay the late Evelyn Underhill wrote: " 'Fear not him that can kill the body' says the Church—or so at least the Church ought to say. Yet armament factories working full time announce to the world that we do fear him very much indeed; and are determined, if it comes to the point, to kill his body before he can kill ours. This attitude is one with which the Christian Church must never come to terms; for questions of expediency, practicality, national prestige, and national safety do not as such concern her. All these derive from human egotism and human fear. Her single business is to apply everywhere and at all times the law of charity; and so bring the will of man, whether national or individual, into harmony with the will of God. . . . She will not make her message effective until she shows the courage of her convictions and makes her own life, individual and corporate, entirely consistent with the mandate she has received. She cannot minister with one hand the Chalice of Salvation, whilst with the other she blesses the instruments of death."

And if the Church is in truth the Body of Christ, the fellowship of believers throughout the earth transcending all boundaries of nation, class, and race, then how can she hire out any of her ministers to serve departments of war in shooting that fellowship to pieces? Even though a chaplain in his own heart—and even publicly—should pray for enemy Christians and never yield to hatred, and though he should minister comfort and spiritual sustenance to many individuals in his regiment, yet *in the public eye inevitably he cannot be a witness to the universal, supranational, undivided, global, ecumenical church.* Not while he belongs to a fighting national army, wears its uniform, and is under orders of superior military officers.

Nor can the ecclesiastical organization that sends the chaplain forth and accepts this contradiction make good its claim to ecumenical authority even though, at home, it utters prayers for Christians in enemy nations and holds conferences in favor of a post-war just and durable peace. The two things tend to cancel out each other. The Church, its missionary movement, and its peace program carry a millstone round the neck in the present chaplaincy system.

III

Tomorrow — and to some extent today — the pastoral ministry of church-military chaplains is going to be scorned by hosts of the very soldiers it seeks to serve. There will, of course, be chaplains who prove the exception to this rule. Here and there an outstanding personality, a man of selfless devotion, will overtop the dualistic contradictions that inhere in the chaplain's position. Thank God if it can be so! Nevertheless, the circumstances of the Second World War are such that I believe there will be a lesser number of these men than before. This time the contrast between the Gospel of the Prince of Peace and the villainy of total war is greater. And for one soldier who is grateful for the personal pastoral ministry of the chaplain, there will be a hundred or a thousand buck privates who ignore or despise him. What is worse, they will transfer their contempt to religion.

Front-line soldiers admire courage, and the courage of the chaplain, protected by his officer rank and perquisites, and inhibited from preaching the uncensored gospel, is in many cases not evident. Although Praise-the-Lord-and-Pass the-Ammunition chaplains may get by for a while, they are not dispensing deep religion. And it is the verities of religion, not superficial popularity, that men in the hell of warfare need. If they do not find saving religion in the chaplain who is supposed to be its representative, their estimate of religion is likely to suffer, to be formed by their opinion of the chaplain. This estimate, in numerous cases, is unfair, as happens too with the layman's judgment of civilian clergy; but the opposition between Christ and Mars is more obvious to the man in the street than the opposition between Christ and Mammon. And if the chaplain cuts a poor figure in trying to bridge an unbridgeable chasm, the common soldier's resentment against the slaughter to which he and his buddies have been conscripted can very easily find a scapegoat in the representative of a religion which, condoning war for 1900 years, has totally failed to prevent it. Such a state of mind is vividly set forth by Robert St. John, an ace war reporter, lately returned from the Balkans. In his book, *From the Land of Silent People,*[1] there is an unforgettable passage:

"I guess it was the church bells that woke me up . . . Easter! Christ on a cross. Christ risen from the dead. Peace on earth, good will to men. All so beautiful, until Christians abandon their Christianity and go to war. As ye do unto them, so will I do unto you. A lot of words from the Bible tumbled through my head as I lay there listening to the church bells . . . Then I remembered a service flag that used to hang in a big church out in Oak Park, Illinois. I used to be proud that there was a star on that flag for me, because I had been over in France in the last war, a boy crusader. I was religious then. I thought I was fighting in a holy crusade. But that war killed religion for a lot of us. I wasn't proud when I remembered how a man used to step up into a pulpit in that church in Oak Park, Illinois, and preach, instead of Christianity, propaganda that sent young boys like me rushing to enlist in a holy crusade. Now I had seen what that holy crusade had done to a lot of Europe. Big chunks of territory grabbed from this country and given to that country without rhyme or reason, until, in sections like the Balkans, they all hated one another. Which was just what a lot of people wanted. Because then they could play one little country against another little country and keep them busy and make them pawns in the big chess game. Maybe you can reconcile international politics and Christianity. But as I lay there in a stolen bed in the Europa Hotel in Sarajevo, which was so soon to be almost obliterated by bombs on Easter Sunday, I couldn't make sense out of it. I wondered where God was, anyway. I wondered how Christians on both sides—because there are Christians on both sides—reconciled these things."

Onward Christian chaplains; *tell* him, if you can.

IV

The military side of the chaplaincy cannot avoid obscuring the distinctive Christian witness on such basic things as Prayer, the Holy Communion, and the way of the Cross.

Take Christian prayer. It is different from pagan prayer because it is centered in Jesus. Rudyard Kipling, poet of British imperialism, has well phrased what we may suppose

[1] From *From the Land of Silent People,* by Robert St. John, copyright, 1942, reprinted by permission from Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc.

to have been a suitable prayer for a Roman soldier who worshipped Mithras, the foremost rival deity to Christ in the Roman Empire of the third century A.D. The lines run:

"Mithras, God of the morning, our trumpets waken the wall!
Rome is above the nations, but thou art over all!
Now as the names are answered, and the guards are marched away,
Mithras, also a soldier, give us strength for the day!"

This prayer was suitable for Mithras; but you cannot substitute the name of Christ and thereby make it a Christian prayer. Jesus sounded no trumpet to arms, he exalted no nation above all the rest, he never blessed the work of soldiers and he said we must love, forgive, and pray for our enemies at all times.

Christian prayer is directed to a God whose care for sinners and compassion for all human beings in all nations is as constant and dependable as the love of the father for the Prodigal Son. God's love does not change when a nation switches over from peace to war or vice versa. Therefore a man cannot love today and hate tomorrow and love again the next day and truly pray the Lord's Prayer. This prayer will not fit with bayonet drill or bombing from the air or hunger blockades. Some chaplains may not see this, but bayonet instructors and front-line soldiers do. In consequence if any prayer is practiced in the army it gravitates down from Christ's type to the Mithras type or to the selfish petition for "me and mine" or that God will do the impossible in giving me strength to do evil that out of it future good may come. But men cannot "gather grapes of thorns," said Jesus.

Similarly the Holy Communion is bound to be debased when you must celebrate it in the context of an army preparing to go out and kill. The Sacrament is then reduced to a rite of personal comfort or a passport into Heaven in the face of nearness to death. This is a travesty of the conception of Communion set forth in the Church's liturgy. There the priest invites only those to partake, who do truly and earnestly repent them of their sins and who are in love and charity with their neighbors and who intend to lead a new life following the commandments of God and *walking from henceforth in His holy ways.* How can an honest man subscribe to that just before he goes over the top not intending to die, but to kill?

The sacrament of the Broken Body and poured-out Blood of the Lord was instituted to commemorate the death of the Saviour who redeemed by healing, not hurting; by uttering truth, not propaganda; by loving, not hating; by laying down his own life, not taking the lives of opponents. Christian Communion is designed to make us "one body with him that he may dwell in us and we in him." It cannot belong with war.

So too, the cross, which the first Christians regarded as the Lord's substitute for the sword, is made mockery of when it is associated with military action. During the last war when British and American Quakers undertook in the spirit of Christ the task of relief to war victims with no discrimination as to friend or foe, their workers needed a distinctive symbol of identification. The symbol of the cross could not be used effectively because all over Europe the cross had been worn on the army uniform of the chaplains, and the churches had paraded Christ's cross with national flags and victory services. So the Quakers had to invent a new sign which had not been debased by military association. They originated the red and black Quaker star to be worn as the emblem of love by their workers in all nations. Always, everywhere, and without exception, that star was the sign of a friend.

To exhibit before a world gone mad with violence the supreme answer of New Testament Christianity to aggression, is the most necessary task of the Christian religion today. Simon Peter who once had drawn the sword to defend the Lord of Life was shown his error. Thereafter the martyr's cross forever displaced for him the soldier's sword. As against the persecution of Nero's Rome he summed up the vocation of the Cross for Christians in a message that the church so long as it supports armies and navies must ever betray. He wrote: "For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps: Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously: Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree. . . ."

The world cannot see that the Church believes in this way of the Cross while she obscures and confuses it by assigning her clergy to control by the agencies of war.

Quakers have shown that there is another way to carry Christ's ministry to soldiers and prisoners. The Executive Secretary of the American Friends Service Committee has written me, "With regard to Quaker chaplaincy during the last war, in England the Society of Friends officially appointed a number of individuals to visit both military camps where Friends were and, what was even more important, prisons in which C.O.s were held. These men were recognized in both the military camps and the prisons as eligible to carry out the religious functions of a chaplain in ways that seemed to them appropriate, but they were in no way financed or subsidized by the army or the government."

Where is the faith or fidelity of the Christian Church if she cannot organize and establish under her own exclusive authority an international ministry of the Word of God in Christ to friend and foe; and a service of comfort and succor to all those who in this transitory life are in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity?

Gandhi

One man, with silence for a shield,
Refutes an empire's vaunted might
And breaks the weapons which they wield
Against his concept of the right.

The body they had thought to flout—
Resilient by a discipline
Their weapons cannot ferret out—
Finds strange renewal from within.

Not this man, but empire's misrule
Must stand to answer charges hurled.
His weakness has become the tool
To turn the conscience of the world.

ELINOR LENNEN.

Even now we are

Sowing the Dragon's Teeth

By A. J. MUSTE

PEARL BUCK, in a recent address to twenty-six Nobel Prize winners, after referring to the military victories being won by the United Nations, uttered this lamentation: "The strange thing is that the shadow of war does not grow less as these enemies grow weak. . . . Why can we not take more comfort in today's news? It is comforting, yes. It is something to be grateful for that our military machine is better than the enemies' machine. Why, then, are we not comforted? It is because we see a certain fate coming closer to us, and these victories do not hold back its march."

Intelligent and socially minded supporters of the war feel that they are living through a ghastly nightmare these days. Events now taking place indicate that we will have lost the peace even before we have won the war. Maneuvering for advantage and power among the victor nations already is in full swing. The following notes on developments in various parts of the earth are in every instance backed up by statements of government officials or of pro-war publicists.

Great Britain and the United States

Clare Boothe Luce, in her maiden speech in Congress, dramatically dragged into the open conflicts smouldering beneath the surface. The modest proposals of such more progressive spokesmen of the Roosevelt administration as Henry Wallace, looking toward international organization and cooperation after the war, she ridiculed as "globaloney." She criticised the idea that commercial and passenger airships should travel freely over all seas and continents after the war and contended for what everybody understood to mean post-war domination of the air by the United States. Though in subsequent comments she tried to soften somewhat the impression of a direct challenge to Britain and the rest of the world, the fact remains that she said flatly: "I applaud what the British leaders are doing for Britain—but I think that we Americans should do the same things for our country. I am not against the British. We are going in the same direction. The only thing is . . . I want to be on the horse that's in front."

And Democratic Representative Magnuson, chairman of a subcommittee of the Naval Affairs Committee, has announced that his committee is mapping a program to make the Pacific America's "Mare Nostrum"—by force if necessary. The program envisages permanent possession of Guadalcanal and many other strategically situated islands. He made little effort to conceal the fact that in large part the program is directed against Britain. "The natural harbor of Tulagi in the Solomons will be of supreme importance. That harbor is so good that the British once considered it as an alternative to the establishment of Singapore."

On their part, members of the British Parliament have been openly complaining in the Houses of Commons and Lords that the United States is specializing in building transports that can easily be transformed into passenger and freight airliners after the war, while England builds bombers that will be useless in the post-war race for air supremacy.

Many other instances of the U. S.-British conflict might be cited. Kingsley Martin, the brilliant editor of the London *New Statesman and Nation,* summed the thing up in a recent issue of the *New Republic:* "The real difficulties today spring from the underlying question of power. During the war we try to hide from ourselves and each other that capitalist rivalry tends not to disappear but to increase. Beneath the surface British business fears the inevitable expansion of American power, while Americans resent the tenacity of British imperialism."

North Africa, Vichy, and Appeasement

In recent years all who have not supported the policy of war against Hitler and Mussolini, have had hurled at them the epithet "appeasers of Fascism," which was supposed to damn them utterly and forever. The only decent course was to fight Fascism to the limit wherever it appeared—except, perhaps, in one's own country. But when we invaded North Africa, the United States—and, to a somewhat lesser extent, Britain—began to collaborate with known fascists and anti-democrats and to put them in positions of power.

First Darlan, Vichy's military chief, was recognized and made an ally. When he was assassinated, General Giraud, all his life a Rightist, succeeded him.

Very recently, another prominent Vichyite, Marcel B. Peyrouton, was brought from Brazil, obviously with British and American approval, and made Governor of Algeria. His setting up of a Council, composed chiefly of Algerian industries and chambers of commerce, on the model of the Italian corporative system, is hailed by a leading American correspondent as "tangible evidence of a return of some measure of representative government to Algeria."

How far the plea of military necessity may carry this policy of appeasement is revealed by Arthur Krock in the *New York Times.* He told not long ago of an official in Washington who said: "War has forced us idealists and democrats to quantitative rather than qualitative morality as a test. If, for example, Goering should offer to come over with a few planes, we don't want him. . . . But if he can bring the Luftwaffe with him we'll receive him."

Italy

A similar policy has been evident in United States and British propaganda directed toward the Italians. If the Italians will only get rid of Mussolini himself, this propaganda suggests, we will then do business with the Italian monarchy, Italian business elements, and possibly even with the more moderate fascists. This policy caused the noted Italian anti-fascist scholar on the Harvard University faculty, Gaetano Salvemini, to complain bitterly that in effect this propaganda says to the Italian people: "Be afraid of us. We will overwhelm you with American bombers, American tanks, American guns, and well-fed and well-clad American soldiers. . . . Before we reduce your lovely cities to dust, be worthy of our pardon. Hurry and

give us a revolution. But make no mistake. Remember that when the fascist regime has collapsed we shall keep in the saddle the King or at least the Crown Prince . . . and they will keep you in your place if you are not wise." Salvemini describes this as political warfare not against Mussolini but against the United States—"moral sabotage of the worst kind."

Clerical Fascism?

Likewise, not a few pro-war intellectuals are concerned over what they regard as appeasement of the Roman Catholic Church as a political agency and an apparent tendency to encourage the growth of a Clerical Fascism or Rightist regime strongly under the influence of the Roman hierarchy, especially in southern Europe and among Latin peoples generally. They point to the open appeal of the American bishops to shut the Protestant churches out of Latin America, of which the Federal Council of Churches had to take cognizance, and to the support given by the hierarchy to Austrian Clerical Fascism in the past, and to similar regimes in France, Spain, and Portugal today. They comment upon the friendship between the Vatican and Mussolini. They speculate on the role of Robert Murphy, the U. S. diplomat attached to General Eisenhower's staff, an Irish Catholic who was said, in Paris, to be sympathetic to Laval and the counterrevolutionaries long before the war. They wonder about Carlton Hayes, noted Catholic layman who is Ambassador to Spain; Myron Taylor, Roosevelt's personal representative to the Vatican, and Archbishop Spellman, whose present trip to the Vatican took him through Spain and Italy.

Russia

It becomes increasingly clear that like other Powers Russia is seeking for a strong position after the war as against the other United Nations. For example, informed observers fully committed to the United Nations' war effort admit that Great Britain and Russia are backing rival "liberation movements" in Yugoslavia; the former supporting General Mikhailovitch who is backed by the Yugoslav government in London; the latter the so-called Partisans. These observers confess themselves forced to conclude that these forces, far from cooperating against the Germans, have in recent months been fighting each other as fiercely as either of them is fighting the Germans.

Pravda, organ of the Communist Party, recently took occasion to state categorically that Bessarabia, Latvia, Esthonia, and Lithuania—which were taken over by Russia during the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact—are and will remain a part of the Soviet Union. How much more will Stalin regard as necessary for Russian safety and prestige?

Very recently, Walter Duranty, for many years regarded as an unofficial mouthpiece of Stalin, or at least an amazingly shrewd reader of Stalin's mind, stated that when the pressure of the German armies has been eased Stalin will turn toward strengthening and extending the Soviet position in Asia. This danger is now being recognized by our State Department, according to Raymond Clapper, who said a few days ago: "We are not so likely to come into a conflict of interest with Russia in European matters as we are in Asia . . . Russia is developing Siberia industrially. At the end of the war, with Japan defeated, Russia will be the strongest Asiatic military power in the Pacific. That is in the background of our growing interest in China."

China

Under these circumstances, Dr. Lin Yutang sets the stamp of his approval on the speculation that the small amount of aid going to China springs from a reluctance on the part of the United States, and to some extent Britain, to see China become too powerful, and a consequent reluctance even to crush Japan, which might disturb too much the balance of power in Asia. Similarly he charges that the policy of finishing Hitler first and then dealing with Japan is based largely on the British fear that if Japan should be crushed while England was still fully occupied in Europe, American influence would dominate in the Far East, and Singapore, Hong Kong, and the whole Pacific area would be lost to Britain.

It is not surprising that a powerful trend to the Right seems to be developing in China. The one-party state is being entrenched. The Kuomintang is seeking to become the only party and is purging non-party government officials. A semi-fascist youth movement is developing. Liberals are increasingly suffering persecution. There is a good deal of imperialistic talk about China's mission in Asia and "a rapidly growing anti-white sentiment that is directed particularly against the British and the French."

India

Here also the situation is deteriorating. The stubborn refusal of the Churchill-dominated British Cabinet to consider any negotiations with Congress leaders is, on the one hand, driving many doubtful elements back toward support of the Congress and, on the other hand, producing a tendency for power to pass to new leaders who are said by Michael Straight to despise Britain, hate and fear America, loathe Soviet Russia because of her unwillingness to intervene in the Indian conflict, and be jealous and resentful of China. As this is written, Gandhi lies at the point of death in his twenty-one day fast. If he is not released, but allowed to die, conditions in India may be brought to such a pass as to make reconciliation between India and the British government near to impossible.

Unconditional Surrender

It is when we see it against the background of such developments as these that we can grasp the immeasurable tragedy involved in the fact that out of the much-publicized Roosevelt-Churchill meeting in Casablanca at one of the most crucial moments in all the troubled history of man on this earth, there came virtually nothing except a demand that other nations surrender unconditionally to what Lin Yutang describes as "Anglo-American domination of the peace and of the post-war world." To quote one more ardent supporter of the war, Dorothy Thompson, we are trying to egg the German people on to revolt against Hitler but "a revolution which comes into power only to give away its power the next moment, in an unconditional surrender to other outside powers, does not make sense."

We wonder whether she and other supporters of the war recall now, when the peace is being betrayed and ravished and murdered even before hostilities have ceased, that in December, 1929 she wrote in the *Pictorial Review:* "If I had children I would tell them just one thing about the last war and I would tell it to them over and over again: No nation won it. Everybody lost it. And from now on all great wars will always be lost by all the combatants."

The world's great men of God have always used meditation. Why? What has it meant to them? And how does one go about meditating?

The Why and How of Meditation

By ALLAN HUNTER*

WHY meditate?

Because thus we can put ourselves consciously in the presence of power that can magnetize us with more capacity and desire to point accurately in life's true direction. Each of us is a compass needle. We have it in us to point toward the Magnetic Pole. The fact that most of the time we let ourselves be turned toward the south or the east or the west need not discourage us. We *can* respond to the Magnetic Pole. We do share, in some degree, its nature. But we do not share it enough. Because we are not sufficiently magnetized. We forget too easily what it is we are meant to seek. Meditation is the practice of being reminded, reconditioned.

Bombardiers go through the stiffest of training. So must we, with this difference: the orders are given inside and they aim at life rather than death. A small group to practice with is a decided help; out of such teamwork we get fresh insights and the sense of reinforcement. Books also are a stimulus, such as *Training for the Life of the Spirit* (I and II) by Gerald Heard; the more recent works of Evelyn Underhill; or *Daily Strength for Daily Needs* by Mary Tileston. But we do not have to wait until we can join a suitable team with personal coaching or until we find the manual of instructions precisely suited to our temperament. We do not need to be addicts of tomorrow; we can commence today.

Before setting out we had better face the alibis. Otherwise, we may quit before getting well started. Our subconscious, as someone reminds us, is a dog that does not want to be trained. It wants simply to continue as it was, on its own. To prove to our subconscious that we mean business, that we actually intend to live a life full of meaning instead of excuses, we have to sit down patiently and say something like this: "During the next fifteen minutes you are going to stay put in this room, right here, no matter how many fleas there are (the technical term is distractions); no matter how urgent the call to go outside. We won't open the door and let you have your way. You are going to tell us in your own language that you believe in meditation in general but not right at this moment. But we have made up our mind. We know perfectly well that if we believe in this thing we will find time for it. We have managed in the past in spite of all the complicated pressures to find time for eating and for doing anything we really wanted to do. So you just stay put. During the next fifteen minutes we are not listening to your rationalizations for escaping."

The first act, then, is a simple act of will whereby we decide not to be bullied by the inertia of past habits.

It is a good idea to remind ourselves why we are making this commitment. It is because the nature of things demands it, something real we cannot evade. We have met someone who seems to be living on a higher level than that we previously had taken for granted. We have read something that made a secret nerve within us suddenly vibrate, until our whole being became restless for a different way of living. Or our mistakes have brought us to the place where the conventional thing is deadly and now nothing less than a new and right direction is of any use. The point is, we sense that in the nature of things there is something so alive, so significant, so authentic that we have an inside compulsion to put ourselves in line with it. And we know intuitively that to do that we have to still our body as much as we can, and then gradually still our mind until what is most real can get into us. It can not get into us so long as we are a "thing filled with emptiness."

Hard at First

The first try with the untamed subconscious is not generally a brilliant success. We have struggled for fifteen minutes to sit on a chair with spine erect, body motionless, and spirit open. And what has happened? A thousand things. The dog with his fleas is an angel of repose compared with our jumpiness of mind. Why it's hopeless; it's no use going on with a mind like that! One might as well quit while the quitting is good. Better listen to the radio than be exposed to the humiliation of all this disconnected reverie. But something else has happened. It out of sight, so deep that we do not suspect its existence. The subconscious has been getting the idea that conceivably we actually mean what we said, that really we want to have a different kind of consciousness. After finishing fifteen minutes tomorrow it will be even less sure we are fooling.

But are we merely to sit there staring into what can not be seen or imagined? It is often because the whole thing seems so vacuous as well as fatiguing that many enthusiastic beginners stop before they get their second wind. Yet the process can be definitely interesting and energizing. We do not make the music. It is made for us. There is a keyboard waiting to be touched.

Before starting let us keep two other points clear. The pattern here suggested is not a score to be rigidly followed. It is only an indication of some possibilities. At any moment we may find a chord suddenly and precisely answering to our deepest desire. When that happens, we can drop the pattern, still our minds as well as bodies and thus become filled with a special sense of presence.

Second, there should be routine. Unless we are excep

* Pastor Mount Hollywood Congregational Church; author, *Secretly Armed, White Corpuscles in Europe.* This article also published in *The Pilgrim Highroad.*

tional we emphatically need the discipline of being in a certain place at a regular time. If we wait for inspiration and allow our practice to be squeezed in at the convenience of an overcrowded schedule, what we are saying by such carelessness is that meditation is not very important. The regularity is not deadening. Faithfulness as to basic rules will release rather than mechanize the spirit. A pattern of meditation, if real, has to be a growing thing. During one month there will be a special emphasis. One chord or note will mean more than any other. A few months later this will be almost forgotten. Some new harmony will have taken its place. The experience is dynamic, not static. But let us begin:

Often the best opening note is the simple reminder that one is *breathing the sky.* There is something infinite above, like the blue beyond and over-arching us, that is greater than ourselves, greater than our group, greater than all men put together. This actuality, however, is not just far away. It is inconceivably near, "nearer to us than we are to ourselves." Our intellects cannot grasp such vastness-intimacy. We simply recall that it *exists.*

The next note vibrates more easily in our senses. Our attention turns to the *persons* in whom this mysterious Presence is most vividly reflected. That laughing woman now among her old friends in the East End of London where nearly all the windows have been shattered by bombs, who awakes in the morning instantly to declare "Thou art shining beauty, radiant joy, creative power, all-pervading love, perfect understanding, purity and peace." That undiscourageable man five thousand miles across the Pacific who keeps on thinking of "the Effort of Cosmic Will that would lift all and save all" and trying to join his own little will wholeheartedly with it. The young Frenchman so much like Saint Francis, who even with his two children not sufficiently nourished continues, while serving Belgian miners and their children, to sing in spirit as if a lark were rising from the depths of his heart. The seventy-six year old man in California who helps his neighbors to see what he sees: "God is; we are in his presence now, he has given us an appalling power to turn away from him; he has given us the marvelous power at any moment wherever we are to turn toward him."

Network of the Dedicated

There is a gold network of the dedicated, some of them close friends, who "go cheerfully over the earth answering that of God in every man." Most of all, there is *Jesus.* Far from leading to sentimentality, the force that comes through Jesus is inexorable in the responsibilities it lays upon us. As we think of his insights packed into a few words, or his encounters with the hunger, deformities, and confusion of men, or the pressure he exerted on the Cross and afterwards, we find ourselves looking beyond the ordinary three-dimensional world into a new kind of awareness, a new kind of being. Here we experience what it is to be alive: "Lose your life to find it . . . Let your good will be all-including even as the good will of your heavenly father includes all."

Goodness that is eternal but that also works in time, light that surpasses our imagination but that also shines through human lives—these two seemingly opposite notes together make a chord that stirs us into humility. We are now about to face the inertia and darkness *inside,* which we have heretofore been willing to recognize only when it was outside. Is not the cruelty of the outside world largely the fruit of willfulness, and are not we beginning to sense how complicated and deep its roots are in ourselves?

For the last ten minutes our ego has been bidding for attention, shouting, "Look at me, look at me!" Now at last it is going to be exposed for what it is: an irrelevance, an intrusion, a hindrance to the most interesting thing within us. Our ego is a conspiracy to make us listen only to fear, and greed, and the defeatism that is always postponing life until tomorrow. It announces itself as the great liberator, the supreme guarantor of all freedoms. Obviously it is nothing of the sort. The job therefore is to get free of such self-centeredness and unless we escape from this psychopathic cell whose walls are mirrors, we will die for want of air. We do not have the right to be gullible any more.

When we say, "Deliver us from evil," we realize that the evil from which we want to be rescued is not merely out there in that awful man and his henchmen. It is in here. It is largely our own lust to get something for nothing masking itself as honor, our own terror of insecurity under the guise of Galahad. We have been playing God. Now we see that we have only been acting like the devil. To begin to sense our former illusions about ourselves, until we tremble a little in disgust—this is the beginning of wisdom. For now we are about to turn toward God in earnest. The recognition has at last come that only He can deliver us from those egos of ours.

The Next Key

And now do we dare go on to the next key on the board —the *nature of God himself?* We had thought of him vaguely before. He confronts us now as Consciousness. The Light to which we are now trying to adjust ourselves is to our nervous, inhibited self-consciousness what the sun is to the radiance of a glowworm. Even so, if we open ourselves as far as we can, some of that Light will enter us and make us different. Even this instant we can think one or two of God's thoughts after him. That is why we are here, to share his nature. The place to begin is in the desire to be sincere. In this Presence there is no point to lying any more. One might as well relax, take a deep breath, and say, "I would rather not rationalize right now. Here I am *as* I am. And I am going to stay here in this ruthless, but healing, Light for a moment more, deliberately, without excuses and with trust, for thou art Truth and in thee is no darkness at all." Gandhi has found Truth taking him a long way ever since he handed over his whole personality to that aspect of God. So can we.

The next note is the *Compassion* that broods over us all eternally. It is so alive that it can afford to seem undramatic. It is so strong that it can afford to appear pusillanimous. It has so much time that it can afford to let men say it is not functioning in this year of our Lord, 1943. Up into this Presence we now bring the sorrow, the waste, the ugliness, the cruelty, the blindness that so easily shock men into thinking that Compassion is impotent and out of date. The mass injustice of what we are doing—through bombs, race arrogance, and the monopoly

of privilege—we commit to the power, the only power that can overcome ill will with good. This evildoer and that welldoer we now hold with unworried attention in the Presence who shines upon unjust and just alike. What we think is the deepest need of the person we care for most, that need we try to think of as God would think. But no, let us be honest. We are not up to that yet. We just think of one person after another as *there* in his Light. We are too immature to understand this fully, but right now we can grasp a little the fact that in this light we are all one.

Have there been too many minor notes? Well, then, we can end as Bach so often ends, on a major chord: the realization of God as the *Owner* to whom we completely belong. He has given us some time, several hundred months more for our body to experiment with; at least nine hundred minutes today. We have been terribly stupid heretofore about time, not because we believed in eternity, but because we did not. Here is a new chance. Perhaps not every moment, but at least the next ten minutes are hereby dedicated to the effort to understand and encourage personality in its effort to grow.

And then we have been inept about moods as if we had the right to be despondent and negative. That right is now being relinquished for this day. The feelings belong not to the ego. They belong to what is everlastingly life-developing, to free us from the ego.

As for consciousness, it can be less like smoke permitting itself to get blown without any plan to the corners of the earth. It can be more like a clean blaze that consumes each experience as it comes, leaving very little ash. This flame of consciousness within what we call "our" bone box is not really ours. It belongs to an infinitely greater and undying fire so vivid, so cleansing, and so strong that most of the time we are unaware of its existence.

But time, and feeling-tone, and thought are not all that we are now trying to offer to God. The *deep will* remains. In one sense it can at any moment be pointed toward him. In another sense it is something so subtle and difficult to get at that only the most rigorous training of body, mind, and spirit can reach it and shift it over to the direction where it belongs. This mystery called the deep will we now try to hand over to that even deeper mystery that, as long as we live, stands before us as *Something To Be Done.*

It was not easy for Jesus in Gethsemane. It is, in fact, so difficult for us that ultimately it is not we who act but that which, soon or late, we must accept as Grace. Faced with this overwhelming fact we are now able to be glad. Is it not a thing to marvel at that we are being allowed at least a little more time, at least a little more power to feel, and see, and decide while still a guest in this body?

Let us go out from this experience singing, with every step, thy praise O God. Amen.

Small Community Economics

V. Community Economic Planning

By ARTHUR E. MORGAN

VERY often an individual working by himself can learn of some community need remaining unfilled, and by his own initiative can supply that need and so add to the quality of the community life. It has been most often by such free play of individual initiative that small community needs have been supplied in the past. The excellence, and also the lack of excellence, of American communities can be largely attributed to that process.

Just as there has been a great improvement in the past thirty or forty years in the quality of small community economic services, brought about by the free play of individual initiative, so progress by the same process may be expected in the future. However, just as in many respects community economic life has remained in a rut from which it seemed impossible to escape, as in the case of the generally low quality of commercial amusements, so it seems that if a superior new pattern is to be achieved, it must be by some form of united, rather than individual, effort.

There is not, and should not be, any one stereotyped method of united effort for community planning. One of the oldest and most general methods is through the action of regular government or through special boards. In this way the public may be supplied with fire protection, schools, water supply, parks, electric power, and a variety of other services. There is no reason why this kind of activity should be discontinued, though there are limits to its normal range.

Another standard method for united economic action is the cooperative. Its activities have expanded greatly in recent years, and are continuing to grow, yet here too there seem to be normal limits of action.

Many opportunities for the improvement and balancing of community economic life are so informal and unstandardized that they cannot be effectively developed by any existing conventional organization. One of the most effective methods in such cases is for informal groups of deeply interested persons to explore the possibilities, and then to promote such undertakings as seem desirable. This may constitute informal but effective democracy. Let us explore the possibilities of that method.

A village of from a thousand to five thousand people, with its surrounding tributary population, may lack some standard services that would help to round out the local economy. These might include a local laundry, a local dairy, a local bakery, or a local recreation center. Probably the most difficult step would be to find a person competent to operate such a project. The next step would be to find the necessary funds, in case the new proprietor did not have

them. Still another and more difficult step would be to educate the people of the community to the fact that services supplied at home contribute to community solvency. (There should be no arbitrary "buy at home" policy. Unless home production is genuinely economical it may be better to buy at a distance.) By sustained effort a small, informal group in the course of a few years might develop in the community most of the local services it can properly support. The same general course might be followed in developing industries or services for the general market. The very high proportion of mortality of such undertakings should lead to careful appraisal of prospects.

There is another approach to the same end. Today in numerous cases groups of young men and women are looking about to see where they might settle down after the war, with economic footholds in small communities. Such a group might well select some community, or preferably a group of several near-by communities which constitute a natural region, and might then survey them carefully to find what economic activities could be added to give greater variety and better proportion to the whole.

It would be an interesting and promising project to take a small natural region, containing perhaps a dozen small communities in a ten- or twenty-mile radius, and to treat it as a single project. Certain fundamentals would need to be observed. Each community would have to be individually solvent, with income equal to outgo. The area as a whole would need to be similarly solvent. By treating a small region as a unit, some elements of balance and good proportion would apply to the group as a whole and need not be achieved for each community separately.

Thus a degree of regional specialization would be feasible. One small community might develop a laundry to serve the entire group. Another might have a dairy, another a bakery. One community, especially suited to truck farming, might supply vegetables for the entire group, beyond those provided through individual subsistence farming and gardening. One community might develop a hospital and clinic to serve the entire region. One might have such natural beauty that it could be developed as a home place for lecturers, singers, or traveling salesmen. They would bring in outside money which would be used in payment for dairy products, bakery goods, laundry, medical and hospital services, etc., from other communities. One or more of the communities should develop industries or services producing for the outside market. These should be extensive enough to balance the regional budget. The money they would bring in and pay out for wages, services, and materials, would be used to pay for services provided in the region, and finally would go to pay for goods bought outside.

Farming probably would be one of the major sources of outside money. If the farms are being centralized and commercialized it might be feasible to set up one or more cooperative farm projects, with centralized mechanical equipment, accounting, purchasing, sales, and so on. A few persons or cooperatives might own full lines of farm equipment for the service of family-sized farms. Individual subsistence gardens, for farmers and non-farmers, would be encouraged. One or a few good-sized fruit farms might supply the entire region.

A single major park and recreation development, located in the most suitable and beautiful spot available, might serve the entire region. In some states it is possible to organize regional park districts and to assess the entire area for their operation. Unified recreation facilities that would be quite out of reach of any one community might be possible.

Regional cultural interests similarly could be developed. Music and lectures that would be unavailable to any one community might be within reach of the region as a whole, at a cultural and community center near the middle of the area. A junior college and vocational school might emerge.

In this process of integrating the communities of a local region it might turn out that some existing community has no reason for existence. It may be located in an unattractive or unhealthful site, with no natural resources and little trade area. In such case the residents of that community might be helped to locate in some other locality where opportunities are greater. Much effort has been spent in trying to keep alive obsolete communities that should be liquidated.

* * *

Assuming the interest of a group of competent and stable men and women, either residents of a related group of communities, or seeking for a foothold for community living, such a regional program might gradually take form and substance through a course of years, and emerge as a new achievement in social organization. Once well under way it would draw to itself some of those many people who desire to be a part of significant and purposeful action. Both the groups which would work on such a project, and the areas in which they would work, could be small or large, simple or complex. Grandiose undertakings generally will be less productive than those well within the powers of the persons involved.

Always some projects would be thwarted by incompetence, conservatism, greed, or indifference. On the other hand, there would always be unfulfilled openings and potentialities which could be the next points of attack.

In the background of such a development one can see the possibility of regional municipalities. Why should not an area which is a natural economic and social unit become also a governmental unit, with power to meet its regional problems as a unit? That emergence would be an important step in the evolution of social organization. The individual community, if it is to maintain and to increase its vitality, must be reasonably autonomous, but not isolated. Vital threads of relationship must make of it a part of the seamless fabric of society. Those who plan to work together for community careers would do well to keep this fact in mind.

Distinguished Service

My son, who valiant flies the sky,
Has killed eleven men;
And he will leave the earth at dawn
To fly and kill again.
The neighbors say that he will get
A shining cross to wear;
They talk as if eleven men
Weren't cross enough to bear.

HOLLIS SAWYER.

In Defense of CPS

By Three CPS Campers

DICK BROWN
CHUCK LUDWIG
DAVE SALSTROM

DENNIS WILCHER, writing in the *Christian Century* of the position of the Peace Churches in relation to Civilian Public Service, declares that "the evidence is that Christian churches are at present engaged in an enterprise wherein the voice of the secular state and not the voice of God is the dominating factor." It is our purpose here to affirm our belief that the exact opposite is true. We speak as conscripts in the camps who without participating in the administration are at all times entirely free to criticize the policy and operation of CPS.

I

The Peace Churches, it is certain, opposed conscription and still oppose it. However, when the government imposes conscription, these churches feel it their duty to share the effects of it with their young men. They believe that the spirit of Christianity they envision, while preventing them from *imposing* compulsion, requires that they work under it where it demands that they do constructive work; they believe that work undertaken in that spirit is redemptive in its effect upon society. Far from feeling complete freedom from the rest of the country's war guilt, they realize that they, because of their weakness and imperfection, share responsibility for war and for conscription. They know that the problems concerning the war are not something belonging exclusively to the state but are "their babies" also.

In the working relationship between Peace Churches and state involving the Civilian Public Service program we deny that the churches are making their will in any respect *subject* to the dictates of the secular state. On the contrary, it would seem, the insistence of the churches on their obligation to do constructive work of wide social benefit only, is a token of their growing conception of the Kingdom of God on earth as a Kingdom that shall be manifest in all the acts of life and not merely in vague, philosophic doctrines.

To use the phrase "separation of church and state" as a catch-phrase is deceptive. For it is from the *error* of the state, and of the human beings it represents, that the church desires to be separate—not from the state or from human beings themselves. In brief, it is from a share in imposing the state's compulsions that the church wishes to be separate. Where the state allows the right of the churches to bear their share of conscription by administering and performing work of constructive nature, it acknowledges the right of the church to engage in concrete action that builds a foundation for peaceful civilization.

In administering the CPS camps the Peace Churches and other peace groups are directing their efforts to maintaining those men who choose this work as an alternative to prison or to military service. We do not believe that the churches have betrayed us or their ideals, nor committed themselves to the task either of keeping the men in camp involuntarily or of forcing them to work.

The respective Service Committees have no responsibility to protect us from the consequences of our actions. We realized when we entered CPS as conscripts that we were and are just that. We know that in reality the state can do what it will with our physical beings regardless of the wishes of the Service Committees. The churches are not the benevolent protectors of conscientious objectors against the compulsions of the state, but rather are co-workers with us in the constructive work we do, as well as ministers to our physical, mental, and spiritual needs.

On several occasions the churches have been willing to throw over the whole CPS program, so far as their administrative part was concerned, rather than comply with orders that were contrary to the consciences of the men in camp. This indicates to us that they are not subject to the state.

In their dealings with government officials they have used the Christian principle of conciliation to a high degree. Their policy is reported to be one of overcoming evil with good rather than resisting evil tooth and nail. We approve of that policy. It seems to us that such success as the churches have had in dealing with Selective Service in accordance with conciliatory methods is one of the greatest contemporary proofs of the validity of these principles as practical ways of dealing with every-day problems.

II

Is the cost justified? History tells us that decadent civilizations amid the press of their conflicts invariably neglect their responsibilities toward the soil. It is the radical religious social concept that constantly strives to remind man of the need to cling to his basic relationship to the soil and "sweat of the brow" by which both spiritual and physical life is sustained. What more significant work can the Peace Churches undertake than the maintaining of these fundamental activities while the rest of the country forgets them?

We agree that money that now is spent on CPS could very well be put to use on other pacifist fronts, such as reconstruction, but we deny that money spent in supporting CPS is, by comparison, wasted.

By supporting this effort, the Church has retained its opportunity to awaken and train young men in a significant, basically constructive way of life. To cure the great disease of society is as necessary as to administer the temporary aid of charity. In that light, who can say that the establishment of small groups of men who discipline their bodies to hard, disagreeable labor, and their minds and spirits to a comprehension of intentional pacific ways of life, is insignificant? We pacifists are so prone to believe that we must elevate humanity from the mire that we forget we are part of that humanity that is in the mire. Until we elevate ourselves we will have little success in elevating others.

III

Concerning the projects of soil conservation, rural rehabilitation, and forest conservation, we feel that in the Christian spirit it is our desire not to fix the blame for the conditions that make this work necessary, but rather to pitch in to the effort to alleviate the conditions wherever we are able. We join with the Peace Churches and the other men in the camps who desire to see the CPS camps concentrate on the more significant projects. Probably such camp projects as that of park improvement are not as significant as the projects in which the majority are engaged.

To the proposal that perhaps government-operated camps would allow conscientious objectors to make evident their good faith, we agree that perhaps they might for a time. But what reason is there to think that a government committed to all-out war effort would concede the right of a conscientious objector to decide what work he could or could not do? Nevertheless, however, the churches certainly should be forthright in acknowledging that many men in the camps would prefer to be in a government-operated camp, and that others have chosen prison rather than CPS camps under church maintenance. Even though the establishment of government camps might jeopardize the entire present system, we should not be swayed in our effort to be fair to all conscientious objectors.

The Peace Churches cannot be said to have administered the program faultlessly. They have, no doubt, suffered their disillusionments in themselves and in us. But if intent and effect are to be judged by and large, the program is one that history will show to have stood almost alone in being useful and constructive in a time when the nation was, except for a few, wholly devoted to destruction.

News from the Peace Front

Gandhi Faces Death

Feb. 25: On the 16th day of Gandhi's fast, bulletins from the attending physicians abruptly became optimistic, with the announcement that it seemed likely that the Indian leader would survive the 21 days.

As this issue of Fellowship went to press, Mohandas K. Gandhi, political and spiritual leader of the nationalist independence movement in India and the world's best-known pacifist, lay close to death in the fourteenth day of a 21-day fast intended to win his freedom from the custody of the British-controlled government of India. He has been a prisoner in the palace of the Agha Khan, at Poona, since last August, along with Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and hundreds of other leaders of the Indian National Congress.

With the six attending physicians warning that death was near unless the fast were broken soon, India's sympathizers all over the world were exerting every effort to persuade the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, to grant the unconditional freedom demanded by Gandhi. So far the British official has refused emphatically to make such a move. Liberals in England and the United States, including some sections of the press, were urging their governments to take the initiative in saving the Mahatma's life. Informed sources were almost unanimous in agreeing that Gandhi's death would cause almost irreparable damage to any hopes of reconciliation between India and Great Britain.

The Manchester *Guardian*, commenting upon the refusal of the Viceroy to release Gandhi, as requested by a gathering of 200 Indian leaders at New Delhi, commented:

"It is untrue that 'no new factor has emerged' as asserted by the Viceroy. The fact of the fast itself was a new factor. If Gandhi should die, the consequences may be irreparable. Should he be released and live, difficulties will be no greater and they can be fought with faith to overcome them."

The London *News-Chronicle* on February 23 editorially called on Prime Minister Churchill to free Gandhi, declaring that it would be "an act of high moral courage at a time when the world's standards of morality are at a very low ebb."

"If Gandhi dies in detention," the paper continued, "India will never forgive us. The heaviest blow yet—and perhaps the fatal one—will have been struck at the prospect of ultimate cooperation between India and Britain."

U. S. Pacifists Fast

J. Holmes Smith and Ralph Templin, FOR members and former Methodist missionaries to India, began an eight-day "sympathy fast" with Gandhi on Tuesday, February 23, behind the bars of a Washington, D. C., jail. Fully expecting to be arrested, the two men handed an open letter to British Ambassador Lord Halifax and then picketed the embassy, calling for the release of Gandhi and other Indian leaders. They were arrested and refused to post bail or pay a fine.

"White Paper" Issued

Even as Gandhi lay near death, the government of India issued an 86-page "White Paper" attempting to lay the responsibility for disturbances last summer to Gandhi and the Congress.

Chakravarthi Rajagopalachari, of Madras, and other Indian leaders had conferred twice with William Phillips, President Roosevelt's envoy with ambassadorial rank, but there was no evidence that anything tangible had been accomplished. United States army units stationed in India will continue their strictly "hands-off" policy, it was announced, and will take no part in suppressing any uprisings that occur.

U.P.C. Resolution

The United Pacifist Conference, meeting at New York's Presbyterian Labor Temple, adopted unanimously a resolution urging the British government to release Gandhi immediately "for the welfare of the people of England as well as of the rest of the world."

PM, New York newspaper, devoted six full pages to explaining the story of Gandhi's life and beliefs, on Wednesday, February 24, as part of a series of articles about India. Most other newspapers buried news of the Indian leader's fast on inside pages, with only brief bulletins from the attending physicians in most cases.

The Southern F.O.R. has announced plans to conduct a work camp again this summer, with details to be made public at a later date.

Tax Protest Stickers, for use on income tax and other returns, are available at 25 for 10c, from the F. O. R. Literature Department.

Coops Win Right to Air Radio Program

"Here Is Tomorrow," dramatized radio presentation of the Consumers Cooperative story, began a thirteen-week program over thirty key stations on Sunday February 14. The program originally scheduled for production months ago, was held up by the refusal of the National and Columbia broadcasting systems to carry the "controversial" material. The Cooperative League of America appealed to the Federal Communications Commission, and members of Congress urged an investigation into what was termed an abridgement of the right of free speech.

The program will be broadcast Sunday afternoons over the following stations:

City	Station	Time
Washington, D. C.	WJSV	1:30-1:45
Boston, Mass.	WHDH	2:45-3:00
New Haven, Conn.	WELI	4:30-4:45
Troy, N. Y.	WTRY	2:45-3:00
New York, N. Y.	WQXR	5:30-5:45
Syracuse, N. Y.	WSYR	1:00-1:15
Philadelphia, Penn.	WFIL	2:30-2:45
Harrisburgh, Penn.	WHP	2:45-3:00
Pittsburgh, Penn.	KDKA	1:15-1:30
Columbus, Ohio	WHKC	4:00-4:15
Dayton, Ohio	WING	4:45-5:00
Toledo, Ohio	WSPD	2:00-2:15
Ironwood, Mich.	WJMS	5:30-5:45
Calumet, Mich.	WHDF	12:30-12:45
Marquette, Mich.	WDMJ	1:15-1:30
Chicago, Ill.	WCFL	1:45-2:00
Milwaukee, Wis.	WISN	2:00-2:15
Green Bay, Wis.	WTAQ	5:15-5:30
Minneapolis, Minn.	KSTP	12:45-1:00
Duluth, Minn.	WEBC	2:00-2:15
Virginia, Minn.	WHLB	2:00-2:15
Hibbing, Minn.	WMFG	2:00-2:15
Fargo, N. D.	WDAY	3:45-4:00
Yankton, S. D.	WNAX	4:30-4:45
Amarillo, Texas	KGNC	5:30-5:45
Lubbock, Texas	KFYC	4:15-4:30
Los Angeles, Cal.	KFWB	2:45-3:00
San Jose, Cal.	KQW	4:30-4:45
Spokane, Wash.	KHQ	3:45-4:00
Portland, Ore.	KGW	1:45-2:00

Government to Free 40,000 Evacuee Workers

The War Relocation Authority has revealed that it expects that more than 40,000 Japanese-American workers will be released from Relocation Centers by the end of this year. Estimating that only about 10 per cent of the population of the camps is disloyal, the WRA believed that by the middle of next year only this group will remain in custody. Approximately 25,000 evacuees are expected to be released by September, about half of whom will be workers and the rest dependents.

Ironically, the army is recruiting men from within the camps, for the purpose of building up a Japanese-American "combat unit." Liberals have expressed dissatisfaction with this indication that racial segregation within the army is to be extended to this new group.

Mass Meeting Urges Food for Europe

The move to allow food to be sent to the starving children of occupied Europe received fresh impetus from several sources during the past month.

In New York, 2,500 people gathered for a mass meeting in Carnegie Hall on February 21 to hear former President Herbert Hoover, Norman Thomas, Rufus Jones, Anne Morgan, James Wood Johnson, and others urge immediate action on the part of the United States and British governments.

Pointing out that Swedish ships, South American food, and money belonging to the exiled governments themselves were available, Mr. Hoover added that "reports show whole districts in which 35 per cent of the children react to tuberculosis tests and in some districts as high as 60 per cent. If the child life of these democracies is to be saved it must be saved now." Mr. Hoover's speech was broadcast to a national audience through the Columbia Broadcasting System.

No Food Diverted

Rufus Jones, speaking for the American Friends Service Committee, told the audience that that organization has for two years been feeding 85,000 children and giving milk to 10,000 babies in southern France, and that "not one ounce of our food has been diverted."

This complements the statement of Howard E. Kershner, Director of Relief for the AFSC, who declared recently: "The Germans have never interfered with our work. We have never lost a mouthful of food. Neither have the small amounts which we have brought into France enabled the Germans to take any more of French food stocks. . . . The fact that we had a little food somewhere in a colony of children or were feeding a few children in some of the city schools did not make any greater accumulation of French food anywhere that they could seize. It only meant that these children were eating instead of starving."

Pacifists Buy $690,000 In "Civilian Bonds"

Pacifists who invested their money in "Civilian Bonds" in lieu of the purchase of "War Bonds" did so to the amount of $690,770 from August through December, 1942, the office of the Secretary of the Treasury revealed recently. Sales for December alone amounted to $174,150.

Pennsylvania pacifists had bought the largest amounts, totalling $144,750, with Ohio and Iowa in second and third places with $113,050 and $108,650, respectively. Only eight states in the country had no bond sales recorded.

C.O. Items

Sentencing of pacifists for long terms for violation of the Selective Service Act continued unabated during the past month. Among those sentenced was David White, FOR field secretary, who received five years for failure to report for induction to CPS camp.

Three men who walked out of the CPS camp at Big Flats, N. Y., were sentenced to 2½ years each, at Buffalo. They were George Kingsley, Stanley Murphy, and Louis Taylor.

* * *

Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson has announced that henceforth all conscientious objectors taking noncombatant service in the army (1AO) will automatically be assigned to the medical corps. The *Reporter* (NSBRO) says that "it is understood that this also applies to men in CPS who transfer to the army."

A list of conscientious objectors now in prison is being compiled by the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Correspondents of such men are asked to supply their names and release dates to John M. Swomley, Jr., Associate Secretary of the F.O.R.

* * *

The National Service Board for Religious Objectors has announced that the cost of maintenance per man per month in CPS camps has been reduced from $35 to $30. The change went into effect as of January 1, 1943.

* * *

Gordon Hirabayashi, Japanese-American pacifist who refused to obey evacuation orders from the West Coast, has been released from prison and is now working for the American Friends Service Committee in relocation work in the Midwest.

Pacifist Farmers Meet

New England pacifist farmers will meet at Northfield, Mass., on April 2, 3, and 4, it was announced by Stephen Leeman, of the Rural Cooperative Communities Conference, New City, N. Y., who is in charge of arrangements.

Jehovah's Witness Rights Upheld by Appeals Court

CHARLOTTE, N. C. (RNS)—The U. S. Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals here upheld the conviction and sentencing of a Richwood, W. Va., deputy sheriff for mistreating a group of Jehovah's Witnesses.

The deputy, Martin L. Callete, was convicted of violating the rights of nine members of the religious sect on June 29, 1940 after the group had appealed to him for protection. He was sentenced to serve 12 months in prison and fined $1,000.

In upholding the conviction, the Circuit Court of Appeals, in an opinion written by Judge A. M. Dobie of Charlottesville, Va., held that the deputy had violated rights guaranteed members of the religious sect in the 14th Amendment to the Constitution and asserted that "we are concerned here with protecting the rights of the victims, no matter how locally unpalatable they may be as a result of their seeming fanaticism. These rights include free speech, freedom of religion, immunity from illegal restraint, and equal protection."

New England FOR Plans Work Camp

A spring work camp for young people has been announced by the Fellowship of Reconciliation. The camp, which will have as a project the putting into shape of a farm to be used for a camp for Negro children from Harlem, will be located in the hills near Winchester, New Hampshire. It will run from March 20 to April 4.

Work projects will include felling trees for lumber, repairing a dam, building a fire escape, and several other needed items. Cost is estimated to be about nine dollars per week, and reservations must be made by March 10 with the Directors, Kaye and Dennis Nyberg, 409 Prospect Street, New Haven, Conn.

Plans are under way for the formation of a pacifist fellowship of Southern Baptists to be related to the F.O.R. in the same way as the Episcopal, Disciples, Baptist, and other denominational fellowships. Any members of Southern Baptist churches who might be interested in this development may correspond with Wm. M. Hammond, Jr., P.O. Box 277, Magnolia, Arkansas.

F.O.R. Field Secretaries

South: Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.; *Midwest:* Herman Will, Jr., 740 Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.; *Northwest:* Mary Farquharson, 4033 University Way, Seattle, Wash.; *Northern California:* Caleb Foote, 2151 Vine Street, Berkeley, Cal.; *Southwest:* Glenn Smiley, 1411 West 22nd Street, Los Angeles, Cal.; *Rocky Mountain:* Margaret Rohrer, 1418 Grape Street, Denver, Colo.; *Rural:* Carl J. Landes, Merom, Ind.; *Refugee:* Marion Frenyear, 2929 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

Pro and Con

A PAGE OF COMMENT BY READERS

Readers are invited to contribute to this page. Please keep letters brief, since space is severely limited.

Pacifists and Force

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Replying to Vernon Nash's question last month:

Psychologists have told us that in the schoolroom, in the prison, in the hospital for the insane, physical force does not cure the offender and cause him to mend his ways. The only curative force is understanding, mercy and good will expressed by sympathetic human beings toward others. Increasingly, then, our goal is such curative or educative methods.

Physical force should be used with an individual only when we are certain that the offender is incapable of being influenced in any other way to desist from physically hurting other individuals. Because of individual differences, such decisions to use force must be made for each individual affected. It should never be used on a mass of people.

It seems highly probable that when we have learned how to apply the findings of psychology and religion we will all be able to influence people through spiritual forces and intellectual reasoning instead of through physical force. Until we are so able to influence people to refrain from inflicting hurt upon others, we may have to use physical force for the purpose of restraint only. Even so, it should be considered a temporary measure, and we should never stop with restraint, but should accept an obligation to give the offender a better chance to learn the true laws of the universe, one of which is the fact of brotherhood and mutual responsibility for each other.

Once we have agreed to the use of physical force under certain circumstances, how are we to prevent the foolish from using it in any and all circumstances? Unless we can prevent this we will have anarchy instead of law and order. For this reason we have our local police, our state police, and it is barely possible that a national police may be necessary in some instances, though I am not fully committed to such a necessity. We do have our F.B.I. men who would normally take care only of those cases which are not under state or local jurisdiction.

But note that our police force is authorized to operate only in the area covered by legal jurisdiction and, in a democracy, only with the consent of the governed. The state police may not operate outside the state for the simple reason that the people outside that state are not subject to the same laws, nor have they supported or authorized the police in the neighbor state.

Looking at the international situation, a similar rule must hold if we are to have a cooperative world government. Neither under a plan of federation or a stronger international government can we expect the people of a given state to submit peaceably to the rule of police authorized and supported wholly by another state. When Madame Ku, speaking over the Town Hall on the Air program a few weeks ago, asked that an international police force should include a proper proportion of the Japanese Navy, she proved the Oriental to be wiser than our Western leaders who ask a strong-iron rule over the vanquished.

If we accept the premise that government should be over geographical areas, rather than over certain special interest groups within an area, then we must accept the geographical basis for a police force, and restrict that force to operating only within the area that has committed authority to it.

So a police force, to be justifiable, must operate under two basic rules:

(1) It must operate only in the area that gives it authority.

(2) It must use physical force only to restrain individuals, not masses; and must use physical force on individuals only when it has been reasonably proved that other methods of influencing human behavior will be ineffective.

STELLA M. ROBBINS.

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

May I answer the queries presented by Vernon Nash?

1. "Do you rule out absolutely all uses of physical coercion in human relations?"

Of course not. A very wise pacifist, the late Charles F. Dole, said: "We believe in the use of force, yes, of physical force, on occasion. Thus, we restrain a young child from hurting himself or others; and we kindly but firmly take a drunken man, or a burglar, or a maniac into custody, and may even be obliged to confine him for life, if he continues to be dangerous." Does any pacifist dissent from that?

2. "If not, where do you draw the line?"

Where Dr. Dole drew it, in accordance with the general opinion and practice by which three types of persons are deemed properly subject to physical coercion on occasion, namely, little children, the insane, the criminal.

3. "What principles determine this distinction?"

Physical coercion is justified (a) when applied by the unmistakably superior in wisdom and goodness to the inferior therein; (b) when applied by the stronger to the weaker, the disparity being normally sufficient to prevent injury to either party; (c) when applied to individuals as such, not to collectivities.

War violates all three principles, the first two in varying degrees, the third completely. It is the third (c) which is of crucial importance in the consideration of war, for undoubtedly the false analogy of policing—as the restraint of criminals—with war is the chief source of the current fallacies regarding war. Pacifism has no objection to policing. Policing deals with *individuals*. War involves in disaster *whole populations*—men, women and children—with no discrimination between the innocent and the guilty. And both sides suffer with approximate equality—life for life—victory or defeat making relatively little difference. Thus war is the unsurpassable extreme of irrationality. More plainly—it is consummate idiocy. To abjure it requires no moral improvement but only a modicum, just a few grains, of common sense.

HENRY W. PINKHAM.

Non-Violence and CPS

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

There is being prepared a prospectus for a course in non-violence at a CPS camp. May I make a general suggestion about a non-violent program?

Europe was overrun by the Germans partly because non-violent technic and solidarity was not developed. Suppose that everywhere the German armies had moved they had met complete non-cooperation with aggression and invasion. Suppose the telephone central had refused to make connections for the Germans; that taxi men had refused to carry them; that cooks and waiters had refused to serve them; that train crews had refused to operate for them; that factory workers had refused to work for them. Suppose at the same time there had been no violence and no cringing by the populace, but only patience, persistent good will and absence of vindictiveness. Many people might have been executed, but I doubt whether the army or civilian Germany would have supported wholesale massacre.

If our own population should be trained and disciplined for complete non-cooperation with invaders, that training would develop the possibilities of such action, and might in time lead to greater commitment to that method. In the meantime the army probably would heartily approve such training.

In pursuing training for non-violence I should not compromise on the spiritual or ethical content of the teaching, but I should not avoid any phase of the program because it would be approved by military interests. If to make known and to moderately emphasize that area of identity of interests would help your program, would it not be well to make such common interest known?

All through the CPS program the danger of moral compromise exists. However, I do not believe that the way to avoid compromise is the taking of arbitrary and dogmatic attitudes. In working with army men there is the "danger" that CPS men would learn that army men are human. But also there is the prospect that army men would learn that CPS men and their purposes are human.

I am inclined to think that if the full value of non-violence were apparent to the government, you might have the support of the government, whereas if only the negative phases are presented, any community containing such a school may be put out of business by popular resentment.

ARTHUR E. MORGAN.

Negro Fellowship

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

I do not want to receive any more copies of the FELLOWSHIP magazine! I cannot swallow the lies it contains regarding the Negroes. The idea saying that the Negroes are not treated as well as the whites when everyone knows that since Roosevelt went into the White House, the Negroes of America are treated like kings and the whites like dogs. Anyway do not send me any more copies of the NEGRO FELLOWSHIP magazine.

W. D.

Ready March 15

the Most Recent Work of England's Outstanding Pacifist Writer

Humiliation With Honor

by

VERA BRITTAIN

Author of
England's Hour
Testament of Youth
and many others

With a Foreword by

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK

One of the most up-to-date and convincing statements of the pacifist position. The ten chapters, with Prologue and Epilogue, were prepared as letters to the author's fifteen-year old son, living in the United States, and convey a moving testimony to her unshaken belief in the "better way" of love. In England the first edition of "Humiliation with Honor" — 6,000 copies — sold out in the first week of publication. $1.00

Chapter Headings are:

The Wheels of Juggernaut
The Decline of the Individual
Numbered with the Transgressors
Humiliation with Honor
The Functions of a Minority
Their Name is Legion
Youth and the War
They that Mourn
The Descent of Society
The Shape of the Future

Now Ready

With the Master

By PHILIPPE VERNIER

Translated by
EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE

Foreword by RUFUS JONES

Seventy-five meditations written by the young French pacifist minister while in prison. Excellent for Lenten use, as well as for general worship services and family worship. .75

•

Small Community Economics

By ARTHUR E. MORGAN

The former chairman of the TVA and president of Antioch College, now director of Community Service, Inc., has prepared this booklet of sane, down-to-earth advice for would-be "communiteers." Most of this material first appeared in *Fellowship.* .25

•

Interracial Primer

By BAYARD RUSTIN

The dynamic young F.O.R. Secretary has put into pamphlet form his "suggestions for combating injustice"—specific points at which those who wish to contribute help in improving interracial relations may exert their efforts. .15

•

The Balance of Power

The second in the series of thoughtful studies prepared by the Pacifist Research Bureau, a companion to "Coercion of States: In Federal Unions." .25

Literature Department

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION, 2929 Broadway, New York, N. Y.